UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,472	01/21/2004	Joan Evelyn Conover	SAIC0008-CON1	2030

27510 7590 09/19/2006

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
607 14TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
PHAM, HUNG Q	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/760,472	CONOVER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	HUNG Q. PHAM	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 July 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *33-49* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *33,34 and 36-49* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *35* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Double Patenting

Applicants' arguments with respect to the Nonstatutory Double Patenting of claims 35, 42 and 46 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As argued by applicants at pages 7 and 8:

> *The undersigned submits that the highlighted limitations in the Office's chart are not explicitly recited in any claim of the '314 patent. Accordingly, the undersigned submits that a prima facie case has not been established since there is no teaching provided the highlighted limitations.*
>
> *The undersigned will consider filing a terminal disclaimer once the claims have been indicated as being allowable over the non co-owned prior art.*

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As set forth in MPEP 804 (II)(1)(B):

> The specification can * be used as a dictionary to learn the meaning of a term in the patent claim. **> *Toro Co. v. White Consol. Indus., Inc.*, 199 F.3d 1295, 1299, 53 USPQ2d 1065, 1067 (Fed. Cir. 1999)("[W]ords in patent claims are given their ordinary meaning in the usage of the field of the invention, unless the text of the patent makes clear that a word was used with a special meaning."); *Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa' per Azioni*, 158 F.3d 1243, 1250, 48 USPQ2d 1117, 1122 (Fed. Cir. 1998) ("Where there are several common meanings for a claim term, the patent disclosure serves to point away from the improper meanings and toward the proper meanings.").

The difference between the current application and US 6,701,314 B1 is the claim limitation *the metadata... including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date.*

As defined in the Specification of Patent 6,701,314 B1, *metadata includes information including a classmark definition for each document* (US 6,701,314-Abstract). Thus, by definition, the metadata of patent 6,701,314 B1 includes a classmark, and a prima facie case has been established since metadata includes a classmark as defined in the specification.

Examiner will request a terminal disclaimer once the claims are indicated as being allowable over the prior arts of records.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 33, 34, 36-40 and 42-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As argued by applicants at page 9:

> *... the Office recognizes that Marques fails to teach or suggest the availability or use of such a critical piece of technology as taught in Teare and the present application. In fact, the mere brief mention of the use of metadata in Marques col. 3, lines 45-57, as identified by Office, does not suggest that the use of such metadata is intended to function with the same sophistication and specificity of the metadata mechanism of the present application nor the metadata mechanism identified in the Teare patent. Therefore, the importance of such technology as applied to Marques cannot be assumed retrospectively in the absence of a suggestion from the reference that the use of such intricate technology was intended.*

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As strongly suggested by Teare, search engines suffer from the disadvantage that they can be fooled by metatags, which are defined by HTML language. The metatag facility can be used to fool a search engine by encoding a non-displayed keyword into a Web page that has nothing to do with the actual content of the page. When the keyword is used for a Web search, the Web page is located and displayed even though the displayed content of the page is unrelated to the key word (Teare, Col. 3, Lines 55-67). To overcome such disadvantage, Teare method comprising the steps of *creating metadata indicative of each of the documents* (Teare, FIG. 1A and Col. 6, Lines 10-24, *metadata* associated with a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is defined and stored in Name File 64, e.g., FIG. 1A), *cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index* (As shown in FIG. 1A (Col. 7, Lines 1-15), metadata associated with a Web page includes real name of the resource, URL and a

description value. Real name, URL and the descriptive information are loaded into Registry 10 (Col. 9, Lines 21-22). Index 30 associates with Registry 10 and comprises Index Files 34 that contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64 (Col. 10, Lines 5-1). As seen, a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is listed or catalogued *in an integrated library*, e.g., Registry 10, *according to the metadata in a meta-index*, e.g., Index Files contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64), *wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date* (As discussed above, *metadata for each of the documents* , e.g., Real Name, URL and description value, is *indexed within the meta-index*, e.g., Index Files. The metadata includes URL is stored in XML or RDF format (FIG. 1A, Col. 6, Lines 26-39)).

The purpose of Marques technique is to gather, categorize and deliver electronic content to users in response to user requests (Marques, Col. 2, Lines 9-11). Electronic documents are gathered by using a crawler (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 24-27) and categorized based on tokenized keywords (Marques, Col. 5, Lines 46-50).

Thus, by defining the metadata for an electronic document as taught by Teare, the crawler can gather the electronic documents then categorize the documents based on the predefined metadata. The tokenizer does not need to identify keywords and will not be fooled by the metatags. The process of categorizing will be faster and more accurate.

- In response to applicant's argument, at page 10, that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of

ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In light of the foregoing arguments, the rejection of claims 33, 34, 36-40 and 42-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is hereby sustained.

- Applicants' arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. For at least the reasons as discussed above, the rejection of claim 41 is sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 33, 34, 36-40 and 42-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marques [USP 6,182,066] in view of Teare et al. [USP 6,151,624].

Regarding claim 33, Marques teaches ***a system for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories*** (Marques, Abstract), the system comprising:

a scanning tool for scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords for the documents located therein (Crawler is used to seek out the documents from external and internal sources as shown in FIG. 2 via word searching (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34). As seen, crawler *a scanning tool for scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories*, e.g., external and internal sources of FIG. 2, and the purpose is *to collect keywords for the documents located therein* (Marques, Col. 5, Lines 46-65));

a keyword index to the documents built using the collected keywords (Content of collected document are tokenized into term string and replaced by 32 bit integers, and mapped to an entry of vector as *a keyword index to the documents* (Marques, Col. 5, Line 46-Col. 6, Line 7));

a mapping tool for mapping the documents using the keyword index to one or more classes, each of the one or more classes including keywords representative of that class (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56, Col. 6, Lines 6-7 and 13-22 and Col. 7, Lines 51-55).

The missing of Marques' system is ***a computing device for creating metadata indicative of each of the documents and cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index, wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date.***

Teare teach a mechanism for associating metadata with network resources (Teare, Abstract). Teare further discloses ***a computing device for***

creating metadata indicative of each of the documents (Teare, FIG. 1A and Col. 6, Lines 10-24, *metadata* associated with a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is defined and stored in Name File 64, e.g., FIG. 1A),

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index (As shown in FIG. 1A (Col. 7, Lines 1-15), metadata associated with a Web page includes real name of the resource, URL and a description value. Real name, URL and the descriptive information are loaded into Registry 10 (Col. 9, Lines 21-22). Index 30 associates with Registry 10 and comprises Index Files 34 that contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64 (Col. 10, Lines 5-1). As seen, a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is listed or catalogued *in an integrated library*, e.g., Registry 10, *according to the metadata in a meta-index*, e.g., Index Files contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64),

wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date (As discussed above, *metadata for each of the documents* , e.g., Real Name, URL and description value, is *indexed within the meta-index*, e.g., Index Files. The metadata includes URL is stored in XML or RDF format (FIG. 1A, Col. 6, Lines 26-39). In other words, *the metadata for each of the documents is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a uniform resource locator (URL), a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date*).

As strongly suggested by Teare, search engines suffer from the disadvantage that they can be fooled by metatags, which are defined by HTML language. The metatag facility can be used to fool a search engine by encoding a non-displayed keyword into a Web page that has

nothing to do with the actual content of the page. When the keyword is used for a Web search, the Web page is located and displayed even though the displayed content of the page is unrelated to the key word (Teare, Col. 3, Lines 55-67).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include metadata mechanism as taught by Teare into the Marques technique. By defining the metadata for an electronic document as taught by Teare, the crawler can gather the electronic documents then categorize the documents based on the predefined metadata. The tokenizer does not need to identify keywords and will not be fooled by the metatags. The process of categorizing will be faster and more accurate.

Regarding claim 42, Marques teaches ***a method for automatically cataloguing documents located in multiple heterogeneous repositories*** (Marques, Abstract), comprising:

scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories to collect keywords from the documents located therein (Crawler is used to seek out the documents from external and internal sources as shown in FIG. 2 via word searching (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34). As seen, crawler a scanning tool for *scanning the multiple heterogeneous repositories*, e.g., external and internal sources of FIG. 2, and the purpose is *to collect keywords for the documents located therein* (Marques, Col. 5, Lines 46-65));

building a keyword index to the documents stored in the multiple heterogeneous repositories using the collected keywords (Content of collected document are tokenized into term string and replaced by 32 bit integers, and mapped to an entry of vector as *a keyword index to the documents stored in the multiple heterogeneous repositories using the collected keywords* (Marques, Col. 5, Line 46-Col. 6, Line 7));

mapping the documents using the keyword index into predetermined classes, wherein the mapping is performed using at least one mapping tool (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56, Col. 6, Lines 6-7 and 13-22 and Col. 7, Lines 51-55);

creating identification of the predetermined class (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-57).

The missing of Marques method is the step of ***creating metadata information for the documents; and cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index, wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a universal resource locater, a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date and further wherein the meta-index retains the characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index.***

Teare teach a mechanism for associating metadata with network resources (Teare, Abstract). Teare further discloses the step of

creating metadata for the documents (Teare, FIG. 1A and Col. 6, Lines 10-24, *metadata* associated with a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is defined and stored in Name File 64, e.g., FIG. 1A),

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index (As shown in FIG. 1A (Col. 7, Lines 1-15), metadata associated with a Web page includes real name of the resource, URL and a description value. Real name, URL and the descriptive information are loaded into Registry 10 (Col. 9, Lines 21-22). Index 30 associates with Registry 10 and comprises Index Files 34 that contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64 (Col. 10, Lines 5-1). As seen, a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is listed or catalogued *in an integrated library*, e.g., Registry

10, *according to the metadata in a meta-index*, e.g., Index Files contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64),

wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a universal resource locater, a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date (As discussed above, *metadata for each of the documents* , e.g., Real Name, URL and description value, is *indexed within the meta-index*, e.g., Index Files. The metadata includes URL is stored in XML or RDF format (FIG. 1A, Col. 6, Lines 26-39). In other words, *the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a pre-defined data structure including at least one of the following attributes a universal resource locater, a title, an author, an abstract, a collection, a keyword, one or more matched words, a path, a classmark, a classification date and a last modified date*);

wherein the meta-index retains the characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents (Teare, Col. 10, Lines 5-21) ***such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index*** (Teare, Col. 21, Line 39-Col. 22, Lines 40).

As strongly suggested by Teare, search engines suffer from the disadvantage that they can be fooled by metatags, which are defined by HTML language. The metatag facility can be used to fool a search engine by encoding a non-displayed keyword into a Web page that has nothing to do with the actual content of the page. When the keyword is used for a Web search, the Web page is located and displayed even though the displayed content of the page is unrelated to the key word (Teare, Col. 3, Lines 55-67).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include metadata mechanism as taught by Teare into the Marques technique. By defining the metadata for an electronic document as taught by Teare, the crawler can gather the electronic documents then categorize the documents based on the predefined metadata.

The tokenizer does not need to identify keywords and will not be fooled by the metatags. The process of categorizing will be faster and more accurate.

Regarding claim 46, Marques teaches ***a method for automatically cataloguing documents located on at least a first and second website*** (Marques, Abstract), comprising:

scanning the at least a first and second website to collect keywords from the documents located therein, wherein documents located on a first website are in a first format and documents located on a second website are in a second format (Crawler is used to seek out the documents from Web sites as shown in FIG. 2 via word searching (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34). The documents are in different format (Col. 3, Lines 45-57). As seen, crawler a scanning tool for *scanning the at least a first and second website to collect keywords from the documents located therein*, and the purpose is *to collect keywords for the documents located therein* (Marques, Col. 5, Lines 46-65), *documents located on a first website are in a first format and documents located on a second website are in a second format*, e.g., PCFile, FTP at Col. 3, Lines 45-57);

building a keyword index to the documents stored on the at least a first and second website using the collected keywords (Content of collected document are tokenized into term string and replaced by 32 bit integers, and mapped to an entry of vector as *a keyword index to the documents stored on the at least a first and second website using the collected keywords* (Marques, Col. 5, Line 46-Col. 6, Line 7));

mapping the documents using the keyword index into predetermined classes, wherein the mapping is performed using at least one mapping tool (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56, Col. 6, Lines 6-7 and 13-22 and Col. 7, Lines 51-55).

creating identification of the predetermined class (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-57).

The missing of Marques method is the step of ***creating metadata information for the documents; and cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a***

meta-index, wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a third format and further wherein the meta-index retains the first format and the second format, respectively, for the documents in each of the at least a first and second websites such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the at least a first and second website utilizing the meta-index.

Teare teach a mechanism for assocjating metadata with network resources (Teare, Abstract). Teare further discloses the step of

creating metadata information for the documents (Teare, FIG. 1A and Col. 6, Lines 10-24, *metadata* associated with a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is defined and stored in Name File 64, e.g., FIG. 1A),

cataloguing each of the documents in an integrated library according to the metadata in a meta-index (As shown in FIG. 1A (Col. 7, Lines 1-15), metadata associated with a Web page includes real name of the resource, URL and a description value. Real name, URL and the descriptive information are loaded into Registry 10 (Col. 9, Lines 21-22). Index 30 associates with Registry 10 and comprises Index Files 34 that contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64 (Col. 10, Lines 5-1). As seen, a *document* or network resource, e.g., Web page, is listed or catalogued *in an integrated library*, e.g., Registry 10, *according to the metadata in a meta-index*, e.g., Index Files contain an index of all real names and values stored in Name File 64),

wherein the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a third format (As discussed above, *metadata for each of the documents* , e.g., Real Name, URL and description value, is *indexed within the meta-index*, e.g., Index Files. The metadata is stored in XML or RDF format (FIG. 1A, Col. 6, Lines 26-39). In other words, *the metadata for each of the documents indexed within the meta-index is stored in a third format*);

wherein the meta-index retains the first format and the second format, respectively, for the documents in each of the at least a first and second websites (Teare, Col. 10, Lines 5-21) ***such that a***

user may access one or more of the documents within the at least a first and second website utilizing the meta-index (Teare, Col. 21, Line 39-Col. 22, Lines 40).

As strongly suggested by Teare, search engines suffer from the disadvantage that they can be fooled by metatags, which are defined by HTML language. The metatag facility can be used to fool a search engine by encoding a non-displayed keyword into a Web page that has nothing to do with the actual content of the page. When the keyword is used for a Web search, the Web page is located and displayed even though the displayed content of the page is unrelated to the key word (Teare, Col. 3, Lines 55-67).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include metadata mechanism as taught by Teare into the Marques technique. By defining the metadata for an electronic document as taught by Teare, the crawler can gather the electronic documents then categorize the documents based on the predefined metadata. The tokenizer does not need to identify keywords and will not be fooled by the metatags. The process of categorizing will be faster and more accurate.

Regarding claim 34, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 33, Teare further discloses ***the meta-index retains characteristics of each of the multiple heterogeneous repositories as applied to each of the documents*** (Teare, Col. 10, Lines 5-21) ***such that a user may access one or more of the documents within the multiple heterogeneous repositories utilizing the meta-index*** (Teare, Col. 21, Line 39-Col. 22, Lines 40).

Regarding claims 36, 44 and 48, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 33, 42 and 46, Teare

further discloses ***the metadata is stored in eXensible Markup Language (XML) format*** (Teare, Col. 6, Lines 26-34).

Regarding claims 37, 45 and 49, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claims 33, 42 and 46, Teare further discloses ***the metadata is stored in Resource Description Framework (RDF) format*** (Teare, Col. 6, Lines 35-39).

Regarding claim 38, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 33, Marques further discloses ***the scanning tool is at least one spider*** (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34).

Regarding claim 39, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 33, Marques further discloses ***the mapping tool is a domain ontology*** (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56).

Regarding claim 40, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 39, Marques further discloses ***the domain ontology is a classification hierarchy*** (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 35-56).

Regarding claim 43, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 42, Marques further discloses ***scanning the at least one information repository to collect keywords is performed by a spider*** (Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34).

Regarding claim 47, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 46, Marques further discloses ***scanning the at least a first and second website to collect keywords is performed by a spider*** ((Marques, Col. 3, Lines 28-34).

Claims 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marques [USP 6,182,066] and Teare et al. [USP 6,151,624] as applied to claim 33, and further in view of Becker [USP 6,301,579 B1].

Regarding to claim 41, Marques and Teare, in combination, teach all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above with respect to claim 33, but fail to disclose ***the mapping tool is a neural network***. Becker teaches a method for constructing a decision table classifier (Becker, Abstract). Becker further discloses neural network as a well-known type classifier (Becker, Col. 2, lines 7-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Marques and Teare system by including a neural network for classification in order to organize electronic documents for storage and subsequent retrieval.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 35 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. PHAM whose telephone number is 571-272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM T. VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you

would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HUNG Q PHAM
Examiner
Art Unit 2168

September 5, 2006

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100